

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
13 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
14

15 JOHN DOE #1 AND JOHN DOE #2,

16 Plaintiffs,

17 v.

18 TWITTER, INC.,

19 Defendant.
20

Case No. 3:21-cv-00485-JCS

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
DEFENDANT TWITTER, INC.'S MOTION TO
DISMISS PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED
COMPLAINT**

Hearing Date: July 30, 2021

Hearing Time: 9:30 a.m.

Judge: Honorable Joseph C. Spero

21 Defendant Twitter, Inc.'s ("Twitter") Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' First Amended
22 Complaint (the "Motion to Dismiss") was heard on July 30, 2021 at 9:30 a.m. by this Court. Having
23 considered all papers filed in support of and in opposition to the Motion to Dismiss, oral arguments
24 of counsel, and all other pleadings and papers on file herein, the Court finds as follows:

- 25 1. Twitter is entitled to immunity from all of Plaintiffs' claims pursuant to Section 230 of the
26 Communications Decency Act, 47 U.S.C. § 230.
27 2. Plaintiffs have also failed to state a claim for violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1595, 18 U.S.C.
28 §§ 2258A & 2258B, California products liability, negligence, gross negligence, negligence

1 per se, and negligent infliction of emotional distress, Cal. Civ. Code § 1708.85, and under
2 Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200.

3 Good cause appearing therefor, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Twitter's Motion to
4 Dismiss is **GRANTED** and Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint is **DISMISSED** in its entirety
5 **WITH PREJUDICE**.

6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7
8 Dated: _____

The Hon. Joseph C. Spero
United States Magistrate Judge